

Remarks:

Applicant acknowledges the indication of allowance of claims 12 – 14 in the Official Action of July 20, 2005. Applicant also acknowledges the indication of allowability of claims 5, 6, 8 - 10 and 22. In the forgoing restatement of the claims of the present application, applicant has amended claims 1, 6, 8, and 19; applicant has added new claims 23 – 28. Applicant has cancelled claims 3 – 5, 7, and 22. Claims 11 and 15 – 18 were previously cancelled, and the text of those claims is not reproduced in the forgoing restatement.

In view of the indications of allowability found in the Official Action of July 20, 2005, applicant has restated independent claim 1 to include the limitations originally found in claim 5, and cancelled claim 5. While claim 1, as amended, does not include the limitations found in claim 4, from which claim 5 was previously dependent, applicant believes claim 1 has been amended to define subject matter that is patentable over the art of record. In view of this amendment to include the subject matter of claim 5, the obviousness type double patenting rejections of claim 1 found in the Official Action of July 20, 2005, are believed to have been rendered moot. Claim 1 should be allowed in view of this amendment.

Claim 6 has been amended to stand in independent form and to include all of the limitations of claim 1 and 4. Applicant understands claim 6 to be allowable in this form, and believes that claim 6 should be allowed in view of this amendment.

Claim 8 has been amended to stand in independent form and to include all of the limitations of claim 1. Applicant understands claim 8 to be allowable in this form, and believes that claim 8 should be allowed in view of this amendment.

Applicant has restated independent claim 19 to include the limitations originally found in claim 22, and cancelled claim 22. While claim 19 as amended does not include the limitations found in either claim 20 or 21, from which claim 22 was previously dependent, applicant believes claim 19 has been amended to define subject matter that is patentable over the art of record. Claim 19 should be allowed in view of this amendment.

New dependent claims 23-28 have been added to this application. Claims 23 and 24 are identical to claim 2, but depend from claims 6 and 8, respectively. Claim 25 is substantially identical to cancelled claim 3, but depends from claim 8. Claim 26

is substantially identical to cancelled claim 4, but depends from claim 8. Claim 27 is substantially identical to cancelled claim 7, but depends from claim 8. Claim 28 is substantially identical to cancelled claim 5, but depends from claim 8. Claims 23-28 do not present new issues for patentability and are allowable at least on the same basis as the respective claims from which they depend.

In view of the amendment of the claims to adopt the position of the Examiner as understood by the applicant on allowable subject matter, no comments concerning the prior art are believed to be required. With these changes, the present application is now believed to be ready for grant, and applicant requests that it be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A. James Richardson', written in a cursive style.

A. James Richardson  
Reg. No. 26,983

AJR/cbw

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
One Indiana Square, Suite 1600  
Indianapolis, IN 46204  
(317) 636-0886 (telephone)  
(317) 634-6701 (facsimile)

**USER NUMBER 27879**